



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,383	07/24/2003	James L. Kroening	P1905US00	9803
24333	7590	11/18/2005	EXAMINER	
GATEWAY, INC. ATTN: SCOTT CHARLES RICHARDSON 610 GATEWAY DRIVE MAIL DROP Y-04 N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049			PATEL, KAUSHIKKUMAR M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/626,383

Applicant(s)

KROENING, JAMES L.

Examiner

Kaushikkumar Patel

Art Unit

2188

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 5, lines 1-4, "The storage device 135...other machine-readable media. The storage device is shown to include Host Protected Area (HPA) 141 in drawing and mentioned in specification (page 5, lines 10-11). As per P.A.R.T.I.E.S. specification, the HPA is reserved in Hard Disk Drives (HDD). Accordingly the storage should not include RAM and other kind of storage devices other than HDD, as mentioned in the specification above.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawano et al. (US 2003/0229768) (Kawano herein after) and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA herein after).

As per claim 1, Kawano teaches a method:

Copying contents of a protected area of a first storage device to a user area of the first storage device (taught as storage device having two partitions (paragraph [0033]) and the user data is backed up to the PARTIES partition and retrieved the data back to user partition (paragraph [0039]) thus inherently teaches contents of the protected area are copied to the user area of the storage device).

Kawano fails to teach saving user area to a second storage device. But as per APA users backup their storage devices (first storage device) to backup storage devices (specification page 2, lines 24-25). It would have obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have backed up the user partition data to second storage device so that data can be retrieved in case of damage to the first storage device (specification page 2, lines 19-25)

As per claim 2, Kawano teaches the program, which causes the computer to execute the accessing function (paragraph [0020]). Kawano also teaches that the program can be distributed (downloaded) via a network (paragraph [0021]).

As per claims 3 and 4, APA teaches that the user area of the storage devices are saved to the second storage devices directly connected to electronic device or indirectly connected, e.g. attached to the backup server (specification page 2, lines 25-26).

As per claim 5, Kawano teaches that booting to protected area and administering the user data (paragraph [0033]).

As per claim 6, As per APA the protected areas are not accessible by the operating system (specification page 2, lines 30-32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention have booted back to user

Art Unit: 2188

partition to have access to operating system residing in the user area to back up the data stored in the user area because the save and restore functions are performed by the operating system residing in the user area.

Claims 17 and 21 are rejected under same rationale as applied to claims 1 and 2 above. Claim 1, as taught by Kawano and APA above copies the protected area to user and backing up the user area to another storage device directly or indirectly attached to the electronic device, and claim 2 teaches downloading utility software from network or server.

Claim 18 and 19 are rejected under same rationale as per claims 4-6 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA herein after) and further in view of Kawano et al. (US 2003/0229768) (Kawano herein after).

As per claim 7, APA teaches saved contents can be restored to the electronic device (e.g. data can be restored from back up storage (first storage) to the storage connected to the device (second storage) (page 2, lines 27-28) and also as per APA

Art Unit: 2188

operating system is unable to access the HPA, it inherently teaches restoring the data in user space of the second (attached to device) storage).

APA fails to teach copying protected area directory (data) from the user space of second storage to protected area of the second storage. Kawano teaches the data in the user area is copied to protected area (paragraph [0039]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the restoring method of APA by the teachings of Kawano so that the data can be protected from viruses and system can be recovered without using removable disks or storage devices (paragraph [0008]).

As per claim 8, APA inherently teaches saving of data from second (attached to the electronic device) storage to the first storage (attached to the back up server) before restoring. Because one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would know that data can be restored from back up storage device if data was backed up from second storage to first storage (back up storage) initially.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under the same rationale as applied to claims 5,6 and 2 as above.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2188

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As per dependent claim 9, APA or Kawano fail to teach creating the protected area on the storage device attached to the electronic device before backing up the data from the back up storage device.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stevens (US 2002/0133702 A1) teaches a method granting access to a protected area and retrieving a directory of service in protected area and manipulating the data. Itah et al. (US 2004/0243759) teaches method of gaining access to protected area and copying protected area data to another location.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaushikkumar Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5536. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00 am - 4.30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-4210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2188

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
kmp

Kaushikkumar Patel  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2188

Kevin L. Ellis  
Primary Examiner

